

**SURPLUS PROPERTY.  
LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

PROP  
**60A**

**ARGUMENT Against Proposition 60A**

In his speech on the Conciliation of America, Edmund Burke said, “All government, indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter.”

Proposition 60A falls short of the mark.

It does make sense to sell surplus state property when we’re in the middle of a budget crisis, but Proposition 60A only says that *if* surplus properties are sold then the proceeds can only be spent to pay off the deficit reduction bonds voters approved last March.

It doesn’t actually force the sale of the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of surplus property the state owns.

As California’s financial troubles have grown, taxpayer groups started putting legis-

lators’ feet to the fire to get rid of surplus property the state owns—including a Bay Area massage parlor, part of a golf course, strip malls, and fashionable properties in Sausalito and even Tahiti!

Proposition 60A is only half a response.

It’s good the big spenders can’t get their hands on the proceeds, but there needs to be more of a stick to get the bureaucrats off the dime to actually sell properties.

Proposition 60A does no harm, but voters deserve more. Voters deserve to see “for sale” signs popping up on the state’s surplus property.

STATE SENATOR BILL MORROW

STATE ASSEMBLYMEMBER SARAH REYES

**REBUTTAL to Argument Against Proposition 60A**

Proposition 60A helps to lower costs to taxpayers by requiring that proceeds from the sale of all surplus state property be used to pay off Governor Schwarzenegger’s deficit reduction bonds early.

Vote Yes on Proposition 60A!

BARBARA O’CONNOR, Ph.D., *Director  
Institute for the Study of Politics & Media  
California State University, Sacramento*

MICHAEL S. CARONA, *Sheriff  
Orange County*

HENRY L. “HANK” LACAYO, *State President  
Congress of California Seniors*